

116



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/418,418	10/15/1999	KRISHNA A. BHARAT	21708-04479U	8878

758 7590 12/12/2001

FENWICK & WEST LLP  
TWO PALO ALTO SQUARE  
PALO ALTO, CA 94306

EXAMINER

TO, BAOQUOC N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

JR

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/418,418

Applicant(s)

BHARAT ET AL.

Examiner

Baoquoc N To

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 19-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13-18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.

2. ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Claims 1,20 and 21are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based upon a public use or sale of the invention Chakrabarti et al. (Automatic resource compilation by analyzing hyperlink structure and associated Text April 14, 1998).

Regarding claims 1 and 20-21, Chakrabarti teaches:

determining which of the hypertext documents are expert documents [page. 3, lines 1-2];

ranking the expert document in accordance with the current search query [hub score, page. 3, line 10];

ranking target document pointed to by the ranked expert documents [authority page, page. 2, line 45 and ranking page. 3, lines 10-11].

return a results list based on the ranked expert documents [page. 3, lines 11-13].

3. ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chakrabarti et al [Automatic Resource compilation by analyzing hyperlink structure and associated text, April 14, 1998] in view of Yu (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,552).

Regarding on claim 2, Yu discloses the hypertext documents are pages in the world wide web [col. 3, lines 21-22]. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention is made

Regarding on claim 3, Yu discloses the hypertext documents are documents in a hypertext database [col. 3, lines 17-18]. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention is made

Regarding on claim 4, Yu discloses in the prior art that hypertext documents are documents in a hypertext database [col. 3, lines 17-18].

Regarding on claim 19, Yu does not explicitly teaches that two hypertext documents are affiliated if at least one of the following is true: 1) they share the same rightmost non-generic suffix and 2) they have an IP address in common [col. 7, lines 50-56]. However, Yu teaches that the "link 109a, 109b is an html anchor text that reference another web document" [col. 7, lines 55-56]. It would have been obvious to one

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include link that are shared the right most non-generic suffix for easily finding the relevant documents.

4. Claims 5-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chakrabarti et al [Automatic Resource compilation by analyzing hyperlink structure and associated text, April 14, 1998] in view of Yu (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,552) further in view of Oliver A. McBryan (GENVL and WWW: Tools for Taming the Web).

Regarding on claim 5, Yu discloses the prior art that an expert reverse index (examiner equates index) is constructed in memory for keywords appearing in the expert documents, the expert reverse index identifying the location of the keywords in the expert documents [col. 3, lines 31-34].

Regarding on claim 6, Yu disclosed in the prior art wherein a keyword of an expert document is included in the expert reverse index if the keyword is part of a key phrase that qualifies at least one URL in the expert document [col. 3, lines 23-24].

Regarding on claim 7, Oliver does not explicitly teaches a key phrase qualifies a URL if the URL within the scope of the key phrase in the expert document [page. 6, lines 19-20]. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art the time of the invention was made key phrase is exactly be a part of URL. For example, key phrase such as ibm will match with www.ibm.com.

Regarding on claim 8, Yu teaches a key phrase in an HTML title qualify all URLs in the entire document [col. 12, lines 9-12].

Regarding on claim 9, Yu does not explicitly teaches a key phrase in an HTML heading qualifies all URLs in that portion of the document before a next HTML heading in the document of greater or equal importance [col. 10, lines 29-32]. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include this process for easy finding relevant documents.

Regarding on claim 10, Oliver teaches a key phrase in an HTML anchor qualifies the URLs in the anchor [page. 7, lines 31-36].

Regarding on claim 11, Chakrabarti teaches a hub page is a document having at least a predetermined number of outlinks to be an expert document if the document also point to at least the predetermined number of targets or distinct non-affiliated hosts [page. 3, lines 1-2].

Regarding on claim 12, Chakarbarti does no explicitly teaches expert documents additionally must point to documents that share the same broad classification [page. 10, lines 20-33]. It would have been obvious to on ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made the all of these links are pointing to the topic of bicycling.

#### 4. ***Claim objections***

Claims 13-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

As per claim 13-18: examiner can not find in prior art or IDS the following items the fullness factor for each key phrase on the expert document, the expert score for the expert document in accordance with the level score of the edge between expert document and the target documents, a plurality of the edge scores for each target document, and a target score.

5. ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baoquoc N. To whose telephone number is (703) 305-1949 or via e-mail [baoquoc.to@uspto.gov](mailto:baoquoc.to@uspto.gov). The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached at (703) 305-4393.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231.

Art Unit: 2172

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follow:


- (703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication}]
- (703) 746-7239 [Official Communication]
- (703) 746-7240 [Non-Official Communication]

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Crystal Park II  
2121 Crystal Drive  
Arlington, VA 22202  
Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Baoquoc N. To

Nov 29, 2001

  
HOSAIN T. ALAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER